



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

encouraged a clever, though superficial comedy. But in this widespread fashion may be found some of the roots of Romanticism, and therefore of the modern comedy, which owes so much to its Romantic source. Pamela is no longer Revolutionary, nor surprisingly moral, but there are many comedies to-day which approximate the effect of her story, more, perhaps, than some lovers of true wit desire.

HENRY SEIDEL CANBY.

Yale University.

### FRENCH DICTIONARIES.

*Cassell's New French Dictionary.* Pp. 596-616. 7 x 4 inches. D. Appleton & Company, 1903.  
*James & Molé's New French Dictionary.* Pp. 663-564. 7 x 4 inches. Macmillan, 1903.

The dictionary maker seems to be abroad. Edgren's excellent book was published only a few years ago and the two mentioned above have just appeared in revised form, while still others are announced as in preparation. This activity deserves commendation, although it is a misfortune that some one—especially an American—does not undertake the revision of some of these books and make a dictionary that is really up to date; ranking in this respect with the school edition of Sachs-Villatte, for example. We insist on this point that it should be an American scholar and teacher, because both of the above books were made in England and what may be a good definition in England is not necessarily a good definition with us. For example, both of these books define "souquenille," *smock-frock*. Now an English child may know very well what a smock-frock is, but certainly to most of our students this definition is meaningless.

Again, Cassell defines the railroad term "aiguille," *point*, which is intelligible to an Englishman but we should say *switch*. It is only fair to say that in James & Molé, as well as in Edgren, the word is adequately defined.

The Cassell dictionary follows the plan of pronouncing exceptional words only, while in James & Molé all words are pronounced, thus taking up much space that might more profitably have been devoted to other matters. Even such elementary

words as *il* and *elle* are respelt for pronunciation; concerning which it may be said that students who need help in such cases have no rights that dictionary makers are bound to respect.

Cassell's dictionary has the serious defect of defining things that need no definition and, on the other hand, of giving definitions that do not define. Of the first defect examples may be found under almost any word that has several significations. Take for example, "bras." Why define the phrase "être blessé au bras" as *wounded in the arm*? Could it possibly mean anything else? Also: "il a le bras en écharpe," "recevoir quelqu'un à bras ouverts," or "un bras de mer." The same defect is found in James & Molé but to a less degree, the definitions there being generally briefer. If economy of space was a consideration, a large proportion of the compounds under *sous* as well as elsewhere might have been omitted. It is doubtful whether any one will ever look under *sous* for such words as *sous-bibliothécaire* and *sous-précepteur*. Of definitions that do not define *pan coupé* may serve as an example, "et crimine ab uno disce omnes." This is defined by Cassell as "cant," which is precisely as good as no definition at all. It may be added that this phrase is entirely lacking in James & Molé. By omitting useless matter of the kind mentioned above much space might have been saved for the introduction of many new words and definitions that would have been useful. While it could not be expected that dictionaries should keep up with the vocabulary of Pierre Loti or Zola there surely is no good reason why a dictionary which pretends to be "up to date in all respects" (the prospectus of Cassell has precisely these words) should not record all the words found in the principal works of such standard writers as Balzac, Daudet, Flaubert, and Hugo. "Tressauter" occurs in *Le Petit Chose* and "hébètement" in *Les Misérables*, but these words are lacking in both of the above-mentioned dictionaries, as well as in Edgren. One would also look in vain in any of these dictionaries for an explanation of the common phrase "pas gymnastique." "Ascenseur" is found in Cassell but not in James & Molé, although if one should want to know what to call the mechanism that replaces the stairs in most modern large buildings he would look in vain under "elevator" in all the diction-

aries mentioned. One would think, too, that the editors of all these books had remained unmoved by the music (?) of the "sirène" found on all ocean steamers since they all neglected to note this common signification.

It is the English-French part of all these dictionaries that especially needs the attention of a man of common sense. This part is so frequently ridiculous that it is needless to quote many examples. A somewhat careful comparison leads to the conclusion that this part of Edgren's book was copied almost "en bloc" from Cassell with scarcely any attempt at revision. Cassell has the noun "blow-out," *bombance*, but does not have "baking powder." Edgren has omitted the former word but has failed to note the latter. Both books have the useless verb "to barn" and both omit "barn-stormer," which is certainly a better word than "blow-out." One looks in vain in any of these books for "arc-light" or "trolley," in its most common acceptance.

The revision of Cassell seems to have been directed to the addition of new definitions rather than of new words. A count of the words from "bras" to the end of the letter B shows that only seven new words have been added and four old ones omitted as being obsolete. Comparing this space with the same space in James & Molé it will be found that the latter has about sixty words that are not found in the former, so that the latter greatly excels in the fullness of its vocabulary while the former excels in the fullness of its definitions. The mechanical make-up of James & Molé also deserves notice for its superiority.

The treatment of proper names is another matter in which these dictionaries, as well as most others, are singularly defective. Here Edgren has introduced the sensible method of listing all proper names in alphabetical order in the body of the book instead of relegating them to an appendix. If the pupil should meet with such an expression as "cheval breton" he would naturally look in the body of his dictionary for the word "breton" and not finding it there would naturally conclude that it was missing altogether. Cassell has "breton" in the body of the work and "Bretagne" in the appendix. In James & Molé both words are in the appendix while "Breton" is found in

neither book. On this point, too, dictionary makers are recommended to study the school edition of Sachs-Villatte.

O. B. SUPER.

Dickinson College.

---

## SPANISH LITERATURE.

*The Exemplary Novels of Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra*, translated by N. MACCOLL. (In *The Complete Works of Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra*, edited by JAS. FITZMAURICE-KELLY.) Glasgow: Gowans & Gray, 1902.

The first English translation of the *Novelas exemplares* of Cervantes was made by James Mabbe in 1640, who published it under the Spanish rendering of his own name—Don Diego Puede-Ser. It contained only six of the original twelve tales, omitting *La Gitanilla*, *Rinconete y Cortadillo*, *El Licenciado Vidriera*, *La ilustre Fregona*, *El Casamiento engañoso* and *El Coloquio de los Perros*. Other incomplete translations appeared in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but it is safe to say that the modern reader who has not gone to the Spanish original, owes his acquaintance with these tales to the translation made by Walter Kelly in 1846, which was reissued in 1881 and 1894 in Bohn's Library. This translation is not a very brilliant one, its chief faults being its not infrequent mistranslations and its many omissions, without the slightest indication that anything in the original text has been passed over. Still we should be thankful for what this translator has done. As Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly says in the Introduction to the present translation: "But for him, hundreds and perhaps thousands of readers must have lived and died without even a superficial knowledge of the *Novelas exemplares*, and, in so much, he deserves gratitude." (p. xliii). But Walter Kelly's version is certainly wholly inadequate to the needs of the reader of to-day, and accordingly this new translation has been prepared by Mr. Norman MacColl, the well-known Spanish scholar and editor of Calderon. He has taken, as the basis of his work, the *editio princeps* of 1613,—obviously the only sound proceeding. The great disadvantage under which a translator of